



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/516,083

07/25/2005

Gilles Francois Roger Guichard

0508-1117

2003

466

7590

06/19/2008

YOUNG & THOMPSON

209 Madison Street

Suite 500

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KOSAR, ANDREW D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1654

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/516,083	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GUICHARD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Andrew D. Kosar	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 17-32 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Groups I-XVIII, claim(s) 17-25, each invention individually drawn to a single multimeric molecule where D/D' is a ligand for:

1. EDA
2. CD40L
3. FasL
4. OX40L
5. AITRL
6. CD30L
7. VEGI
8. LIGHT
9. 4-IBBL
10. CD27L
11. LT $\alpha$
12. TNF
13. LT $\beta$
14. TWEAK
15. APRIL
16. BLYS
17. RANKL
18. TRAIL.

Group XIX, claim(s) 26-28, drawn to methods of use of the multimeric compounds of claim 1.

Group XX, claim(s) 29-32, drawn to methods of making the multimeric compounds.

The inventions listed as Groups I-XX do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons.

The methods of Group XIX do not use the products of any of Groups I-XVIII, as they require the use of compounds of (cancelled) claim 1, thus do not share the same/corresponding technical feature.

The methods of Group XX do not *per se* make all of the compounds of Groups I-XVIII, as they depend from (cancelled) claim 1, or make compounds of a subset within Groups I-XVIII, thus do not share the same/corresponding technical feature. Please note, in addition to depending from a cancelled claim, claims 30 and 31 are improperly multiple dependent claims. According to PCT Rule 13.2, unity of invention exists only when the shared or corresponding technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. ROSENBURG (WO 99/52877 A1; IDS 11/30/04) teaches multimeric receptor antagonists having a variety of structures including a trimeric core, e.g. claim 21. The ligands are for a variety of receptors, e.g. EPO, TGF $\alpha$ , EGF, GRH, TNF $\alpha$  and TNF $\beta$ , fas, CD40 and CD27 (e.g. page 3). Thus, the technical feature is not a contribution over the art and the claims lack unity.

Further, Annex B, Part I(f) of the Administrative Instructions under PCT states that, “wherein a single claim defines alternatives (chemical or non-chemical)...the requirement of a technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical features as defined in Rule 13.2, shall be considered to be met when the alternatives are of a similar nature.”

The alternatives must comply with subsections (i)(A) and one of either (i)(B)(1) or (i)(B)(2), which requires that, “all alternatives have a common property or activity” and “a

Art Unit: 1654

common structure is present, i.e., a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives” (B)(1) or “in cases where the common structure cannot be the unifying criteria, all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.”(B)(2).

In the instant case, the compounds antagonize a 18 of distinct receptors, failing to satisfying requirement (A). Additionally, the claim fails to satisfy either (B)(1) or (B)(2). Claim 1 recites no specific structure for either component of the compound, thus failing to meet the requirements of (B)(1).

Further, in looking to subsection (f)(iii), it is stated that 'recognized class of chemical compounds' means that, “there is an expectation from the knowledge in the art that members of the class will behave in the same way in the context of the claimed invention. In other words, each member could be substituted one for the other, with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved.” One of skill in the art would not recognize these divergent compounds, or other compounds asserted to have said activity/function, as required, to function in the context of the instantly claimed invention. Thus, the claim fails to meet the requirement of (B)(2).

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The claims are drawn to a myriad of compounds, too numerous to recite individually defined by the core (A) and the ligand (D), as well as the linker interposed therein.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election. A single species is a single compound wherein each variable is specifically identified.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Claim 17-32 are generic to the various compounds, including the species recited in claim 23.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features. As discussed above, Rosenberg teaches compounds within the claimed genus, thus the technical feature is not a contribution over the art. Additionally, as above, Annex B, Part I(f) of the Administrative Instructions under PCT states that, “wherein a single claim defines alternatives (chemical or non-chemical)...the requirement of a technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical features as defined in Rule 13.2, shall be considered to be met when the alternatives are of a similar nature.”

The alternatives must comply with subsections (i)(A) and one of either (i)(B)(1) or (i)(B)(2), which requires that, “all alternatives have a common property or activity” and “a

Art Unit: 1654

common structure is present, i.e., a significant structural element is shared by all of the alternatives” (B)(1) or “in cases where the common structure cannot be the unifying criteria, all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds in the art to which the invention pertains.”(B)(2).

In the instant case, the compounds antagonize a 18 of distinct receptors, failing to satisfying requirement (A). Additionally, the claim fails to satisfy either (B)(1) or (B)(2). Claim 1 recites no specific structure for either component of the compound, thus failing to meet the requirements of (B)(1).

Further, in looking to subsection (f)(iii), it is stated that 'recognized class of chemical compounds' means that, “there is an expectation from the knowledge in the art that members of the class will behave in the same way in the context of the claimed invention. In other words, each member could be substituted one for the other, with the expectation that the same intended result would be achieved.” One of skill in the art would not recognize these divergent compounds, or other compounds asserted to have said activity/function, as required, to function in the context of the instantly claimed invention. Thus, the claim fails to meet the requirement of (B)(2).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Art Unit: 1654

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be



Art Unit: 1654

amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew D. Kosar whose telephone number is (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 08:00 - 16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia J. Tsang can be reached on (571)272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew D Kosar/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1654